THEOLOGY

L. L FEBRUARY, 1947 No. 320

Editorial

A NEWLY published "Theology Occasional Paper"—*Marriage, Divorce and the Church: Chaos or Reform—Which?* by A. T. Macmillan (S.P.C.K., 1s.)—contains a draft of proposals for amendment of the law of marriage (State and Church). The soaring divorce statistics are the sign of a far-reaching disease in the body politic and in the family life of this country, and as divorce becomes more commonplace and an accepted social convention among all classes the disease is likely to spread the more rapidly. The least effective remedy is the mere denunciation of divorce. Its harmful effects on the life of society are not indeed be too often pointed out, but obviously it is positive remedies that are most needed. One would be to clear up the confusion in the marriage law of the State and the Church. The Bishop of Chelmsford may say that "the contract made in the registrar's office is beyond dispute, as things stand, an undertaking in force for life whether or not the married couple recognize it as such."[1] But is this beyond dispute? Must not the intention of the married couple affect the nature of the contract? It can no longer be taken for granted, where their intention is not made explicit, that they regard marriage as a life-long bond. Mr Macmillan proposes that the law should be amended so as to leave no doubt that, while marriage in the Church (what he calls a "declared marriage") is a life-long union and therefore indissoluble except by death, marriage in the registrar's office has not necessarily that character. His proposals, if accepted, would enable the Church to witness more plainly to the Christian doctrine of marriage, and would begin to produce some order in the appalling tangle of problems, personal and ecclesiastical, which sooner or later will have to be sorted out according to a principle which the public can be expected to understand.

* * *

The Church has a ministry to those who, under the present conditions, have been divorced and remarry. *A Letter to those who, having been divorced, cannot be Married in Church*, by F. W. Baggallay (S.P.C.K., 4d.), with a foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury, will explain to them why they cannot be married in church, and at the same time will show that they do not lie beyond the range of the Church's care. The Archbishop says that Mr Baggallay has "accurately indicated what is the Church's position in this matter."

* * *

[1] See *The Guardian* (January 3, 1947).

doubtful whether these statements can in fact be substantiated. Let us go back to the text and examine the three temptations in turn, taking them in the Matthean order.

(1) *Bread.* In this, as in each of the other cases, the key to the meaning of the temptation is to be sought in the quotation from Deuteronomy with which Jesus counters it. For we have a right to assume, until we have evidence to the contrary, that the answerer has at least understood the point of the suggestion made to Him. Now the first reply, the conviction that man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God, is presented in its original context (Deut. viii, 2 *f.*) as the lesson which God taught the Israelites in the wilderness by the deliberate policy of "proving" and "humbling" them by starvation. It was not a lesson understood or accepted by the people at the time. In fact, they retorted by an attempt to 'prove' or 'tempt' God Himself (Exod. xvii, 2). They forced Moses to require of God a sign, to settle the question once and for all: "Is the Lord among us, or not?" (Exod. xvii, 7). Now this act of tempting God, which gave to the place the name of Massah ("that is, Tempting, or, Proving," R.V.M.), became the type of all such behaviour for the O.T. "The day of temptation" of the *Venite* should properly be translated "the day of Massah" (Ps. xcv, 8, R.V.). And when the general commandment became formulated, "Ye shall not tempt the Lord your God," the explanatory clause was added, "as ye tempted Him in Massah" (Deut. vi, 16). Now this connexion between Jesus' reply to His first temptation and the 'proving' of God, together with the fact that the injunction of Deut. vi, 16 is actually quoted in His next answer, suggests that the first temptation has also something to do with the sin of tempting God. This becomes virtually certain when we recall what was this 'type' of O.T. temptation. What happened at Massah was that Moses produced water from the rock: Satan's suggestion to Christ was to produce bread from stones (Luke, "this stone").

What, then, was this first temptation? Simply, the incitement to Jesus to tempt God, by putting to the proof what must rest on the conviction of faith—namely, that He was the Son of God. We find Him struggling with the question: Can it really be that I am the Son of God? It is easy for us to forget that the acceptance of the amazing truth of His person cannot, if He was genuinely human, have come to Him except by gradual and hard-won stages. There must have been a period of hesitancy, as the incredible implications of it bore in upon him. This hesitation was not in itself sinful: indeed, the path of sin lay in seeking to bring it to a premature close. 'Why not satisfy yourself once and for all?' tempts Satan. And so, fastening upon His weakest spot (the other interpretation seems to forget that the hunger was genuinely *His* and not that of His hypothetical hearers), the Devil presents Him with a suggestion whose subtlety lies in the fact that it could be used to satisfy both His physical and His spiritual cravings at once. For the action proposed would, if successful, not only produce bread, but, being a miracle, would demonstrate at the same time beyond any doubt that He was no ordinary man. What was wrong in

e suggestion was, not that a man should want bread, nor even, imarily, that a man with divine powers should use them to get bread; was that He should use the (legitimate) satisfaction of a physical ed as a way of obtaining the illegitimate satisfaction of a spiritual ed. That was precisely the sin of the Israelites in the desert. The old rael the Lord had tempted by leading it forty years in the wilderness d suffering it to hunger (Deut. viii, 2 *f.*). The new Israel the Spirit o led into the wilderness to be tempted and to hunger for forty days. e test was the same in each case: Had it enough faith to know that was the People of God? By deliberate quotation Christ showed that could give the answer before required in vain.

(2) *The Temple pinnacle.* This, as the reply specifically indicates, is ain a temptation to put God to the test. 'Am I really the Son of od?' meditates Jesus. 'Well,' says the Devil, 'force God to declare answer. Put yourself in a position where, if you are, God cannot l to act unmistakably. Just as the old Israel, by threatening to stone ses at Massah, drew from God the act that proved it to be the ople of God, so, by threatening to kill yourself against a stone, force od to reply unambiguously. If you will not prove it by a miracle of ur own, prove it by impelling God to one. But at all events, *prove*

So prompts the Devil: prove that you are the People or Son of od by doing something that is a denial of the very relationship which nstitutes you such—the relationship of faith. Once more, Christ liberately gives the exact answer that at Massah was demanded t not heard: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God."

(3) *The Mountain-top.* This is the temptation which at first sight nds greatest support to the supposition that the general theme roughout is the work or program of the Messiah rather than His rson. For is not the offer by Satan of the kingdoms of the world to come the Kingdom of God and His Christ a clear indication that e matter of the temptation is evangelistic, that it concerns how men e to be won? Before, however, accepting this conclusion as final, let allow ourselves to be guided by the method hitherto adopted, that beginning with Jesus' answer. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy od, and Him only shalt thou serve." This is quoted from the LXX rsion of Deut. vi, 13, a passage immediately prior to the command- nt against tempting God. It is independent of it, however, and the t that the third temptation is not, like the other two, introduced by e words, "If thou art the Son of God," suggests that the tenor of it is ther different.

The book of Deuteronomy sets out ostensibly to present the guiding rinciples of life for God's People in their new home as they are dis- led by Moses from the events and experiences of their late wander- gs. The various commandments are stated as the lessons of history. hus, the injunction not to tempt God is, as we saw, specifically traced ck to the incident at Massah. Is it possible to point to a similar root the Exodus story for the contents of Deut. vi, 13-5? The answer is t far to seek when we note the parallelism between this passage and od. xxxiv, 11-7 (which was actually *written* first is here irrelevant). both, there is the strict injunction not to go after the gods of the

other peoples round about; for Israel's Lord is a jealous God, and He only must be the object of His People's worship. But the significant thing for our purposes is that the Exodus passage occurs in the course of that incident in which Moses goes for the second time up to *the top of the mount* to meet God (xxxiv, 2), where, we read, he was with the Lord "*forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread nor drink water*" (xxxiv, 28).

So, then, the O.T. context in which the third temptation is to be understood must be the conversation between Moses and God at the top of Mt Sinai. If this is so, what interpretation does it suggest?

On Mt Sinai Moses is told of the heathen peoples who will be driven out to afford the Jews their new home. Israel is to secure its national existence by no covenant with them, no acts of intermarriage, and, above all, no compromise with their gods. The other kingdoms are mentioned, not because they have any place in the Divine plan, but purely as factors likely to distract Israel from the singleness of its dedication to the one God. Similarly, therefore, we must suppose that the emphasis in the third temptation is not primarily on the kingdoms of the world and the means of their evangelization. It is rather on the integrity of the People of God. The temptation to Christ is to repeat the easy path of the old Israel and to establish Himself in this world by compromise with the forces that control it. The point at issue, as in the other two tests, is His relationship, not to men, but to God. The temptation is to try to serve God and mammon. The emphasis on the kingdoms of the world is purely secondary, as in Christ's own saying, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?"

So the Devil, foiled in his efforts to play upon Christ's hesitation whether He really was the Son of God, changes his tack. If He would not deny His status by faithlessness, then, like the former People, He would surely do it by unfaithfulness. But no; to this too Christ returns the answer that to the old Israel remained a command: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve."

The result of the foregoing exegesis has been to establish that the Temptation narrative as we have it is the record of a struggle, not about the program of the Messiah, but about His person. It would be wrong to conclude from this that the issue of evangelistic method was not one that involved Him in temptation. Indeed, if we may judge from the nights in prayer which other decisions about His 'work' demanded of Him, it would be very surprising if a considerable part of this preliminary retreat was not devoted to it. Moreover, the actual temptations which are suggested in the interpretation referred to at the beginning are more than likely to have been among those which exercised His conscience. Nevertheless, one must insist that the narratives as we have them are not concerned with these, but deal exclusively with the issue of His person.

This conclusion leads to a reconsideration of a further question. What is the interest which led to the inclusion of the Temptation narrative in the Gospels at all? The very raising of this question may cause us some surprise. To the modern eye the biographical interest

bvious. What is more reasonable than that the evangelist should e his readers, as a key to what follows, some sort of a picture of how rist Himself viewed the ministry upon which He was entering, of v this conception of it formed in His mind, and of the other possi- ties He entertained only eventually to reject? But the evangelists e not primarily biographers. Moreover, as we have seen, the ptations they choose to record have in fact nothing directly to do h the nature of Christ's ministry. That we have found a 'pro- m' discussed in them, despite the evidence, shows what with our rests we expect to find; but it is also an indication that these rests are not the same as those of the evangelists. What, then, were ir interests?

Confronted as we are by an opposition to the Gospel which is dominantly non-Jewish, we are perhaps inclined to forget what an raordinary claim it was which the first Christians made, in saying t *they*, and not the old body of Judaism, were the true Israel, and the heirs of the covenants and promises. To uphold such an assertion, Church had to be prepared to show that it possessed a continuity h the old even more indisputable than the succession of the Scribes Pharisees—no easy task. At the same time it had to contend that was not merely a continuation of the old—the age of the New venant had actually started. To establish these two tremendous ims, nothing less than the whole weight of Scriptural authority uld suffice. A complete reinterpretation of the O.T. was needed; for this task the Church relied on three closely connected methods xegesis. (*a*) It is claimed to fulfil all the messianic prophecies. (*b*) It imed to fulfil the 'Law', and that included, not only the moral law t. v, 17) and the ceremonial laws (Heb., *passim*), but the whole of Pentateuch, which was history before it was commandment. It claimed to see Christ as present in the history of Israel and the rld from the beginning: what further proof of continuity could be uired if this Christ, recently to be seen walking in Galilee, was in t the very same person who was the agent of creation (John i, 1-14), o was in the wilderness of old (1 Cor. x, 4) and who had instructed prophets (1 Pet. i, 11)?

This claim to be the new and true Israel occupied such a decisive ce in the Church's first apologetic that the theory has even been vanced that the recording of each of the Gospel incidents is to be ounted for by some O.T. passage of which it is expounded as the ristian 'fulfilment.' One need not go as far as that to admit the found influence of this apologetic interest upon the selection and sentation of the Gospel stories. The Temptation narrative is a clear se in point. The Church claimed that, as the new Israel, it was the filment of the Law, in the widest sense (Luke xxiv, 44). All that the l covenant stood for was to be taken up in the new, which was de this time not with the Jews but with the Christians. Now this im to the new covenant involved the Church in showing that it d entered upon the title of the People of God. To do this it pointed the fact that there was a definite 'type' (1 Cor. x, 6, 11, Gr.) or torical pattern to which the life of God's true People must conform.

The old Israel had passed through it, but had failed to respond in the way required. The world was to be redeemed by the new Israel 'repeating' that Divinely ordained pattern, but this time giving the answer it had been chosen to make. In modern terms, we should say that in His attack on the world at sin God had devised a plan of assault which was to be decisive for the issue of the war—Operation 'Salvation', to use the current jargon. For this job He chose out and trained a special task force. On the first attempt the plan had met with only very partial success, owing to failures and desertions within the ranks of the picked troops themselves. However, the plan of operation was not discarded. What was required was a body of men, or even one man, sufficiently dedicated to sacrifice himself in seeing it right through victoriously to the end. The concern of the Church was, first, to proclaim that Christ, as the true representative of the People of God, had in fact carried out and completed that operation without hitch or failure, and, secondly, to call its members to repeat its pattern in their own lives.

The details of the pattern need not concern us here. Creation (1 Cor. xv, 45 *ff.*), the flood (1 Pet. iii, 20 *f.*), the descent into Egypt (Mt. ii, 13 *ff.*), the passage of the Red Sea (1 Cor. x, 1 *f.*) all reappear in the economy of salvation. But none of them occupies such a decisive place as the wilderness journey. The significance for the old Israel of this phase in its history was that here for the first time was pressed upon its consciousness its unique position as the People of God. The object of such a testing time had been to purify it as God's chosen instrument and to bring home to it the meaning, privileges and responsibilities of a relationship which rested on grace and faith alone. So, if Christ really was the true People, He too must be shown to have had His wilderness journey and endured the test which proved His person, only without sin. There is no need to suppose that the withdrawal of Jesus into the desert after His baptism was invented to fit the requirements of the scheme. But the interest which recorded it and which selected the three temptations from the many which must have assailed Him is clearly controlled by the overriding apologetic purpose. Here, said the Church, was the decisive issue being fought out afresh. Would He accept Himself as the People of God; or would He deny it by faithlessness or unfaithfulness as the People before Him? Triumphantly it listens, as He gives the very answers which the old Israel failed to make its own.

JOHN A. T. ROBINSON.

Money or Men

WHILE the average age of the clergy increases, the spending value of money decreases, and both portents point to an emaciated *Crockford*. For even were sufficient recruits forthcoming to fill the gaping gaps which before long the course of nature must inevitably produce in the ranks of the ministry, the Church of England would not find itself in a position to maintain them. The appeals which in disordered competition with other Church appeals for sometimes almost frivolously

essential objects seek to collect the necessary funds for this purpose et with an ominously moderate response. But in any case the sums ch they aim to achieve are patently inadequate for the preservation he existing system in a world of risen prices. On the one hand the aller purchasing power of the pound promises to have a devastating ct on our reduced and precarious endowments; on the other it omes clear that any institution which depends for its support on untary contributions must expect to find existence a struggle in a iety increasingly based on compulsory taxation.

ut the problem is not one of financial stringency alone. The umulation of candidates released from the fighting services has oduced a fictitious appearance of abundance in respect of man-wer, but it will be a surface estimate that builds upon this and ributes the sparsity of young clergymen wholly, or even principally, war-time dislocation. Curateless parishes and aged incumbents e become so accustomed a feature of the scene that we fail to serve their steady increase and the end to which it points. Here is tate of affairs demanding the exercise of disillusioned faith and enuity. Yet it is only too evident that a policy of patching and an itude of ill-founded expectancy are still being preferred to the fore-ht which should already be planning for a time when clergymen ll be thin upon the ground.[1]

There is, however, a bright side to the picture. To the present ddle-aged writer his juniors seem better trained and not less able an his seniors, whom he sometimes hears deploring his juniors' ficiencies. From all accounts the men who are in training or who are out to begin their training are first-rate people. Here under God the best hope of the Church, and it is a cause for thankfulness that censive quality is being set before extensive quantity. For a small dy of clergy, expert in equipment and capable of initiative in dy, thought, and action, is likely to prove a more serviceable strument in the days ahead than anything which might be produced chasing bygone statistics. But, if such is to be the aim, certain nclusions seem to follow. In the first place a stop should be put to e continual devising of new non-pastoral posts. It is an odd general-ip which swells its staff at the expense of an already tenuous front ne. Secondly, the rôle which the clergy are to fill in the Church of e future needs to be considered. If, as seems likely, to-morrow's cumbent will find himself more or less in the position of a Methodist perintendent, he has a right to ask that some attention shall now be id to the means by which, and the lay-out in which, he may hope to lfil his task. Those who have the faith to present themselves for the rvice of superficially a waning cause deserve better of their pre-cessors than to be left to cope with preventable chaos. Indeed, a hurch which gave more indication of knowing what it meant to do ight well, in commanding more confidence, command also more oney and more men.

Now there has of late been a great deal of rather hortative talk

[1] *Cf. The Ampleforth Journal*, May, 1946, for a frank account of the acute shortage of iests in France and of steps being taken to meet the problem there.

about the laity, and certainly it is most necessary, not merely for the sake of meeting an emergency but still more for a healthy understanding of the true nature of the Church, that the order of laity should be rediscovered. But it is discriminating leadership rather than exhortation that the laity need and desire, and such leadership must with far more particularity than it is fashionable to suppose be given by the clergy. A kind of clerical anti-clericalism is in some quarters developing into a phobia. But experience goes to show that it is not in places and gatherings into which the parson is fearful to intrude that the laity become most effective. They need him. Their sense of responsibility will develop and the processes by which they are fitted to take up that responsibility will prosper, not as he makes himself scarce, but as he takes them seriously. The wise parish priest will give a great proportion of his time and thought to the promotion of well-informed and effectively employed laymanship. He will see his laity in terms of their vocation and will doubt the worthwhileness of undertakings on whatever scale which leave definite vocation outside their purview.

But the leadership of the parish priest, he being but flesh and blood, needs and will still more need to be supplemented. Where is this supplementary leadership to be found? It is a part of the ineffectiveness of current discussions of lay vocation and service that they remain far too generalized. There are diversities of gifts. None are to be wasted. All should be found specific and considered openings within the order of laity. But then from among the laity will emerge some few whose particular abilities demand peculiar scope. These will not always be the most vocal, yet to be reasonably vocal is apt to be a *sine qua non* of leadership. A leader must needs express himself. It will be the wisdom of the Church to pay especial regard to such, for here is the still largely untapped reservoir from which may be drawn the amateur but not amateurish ministry which is clearly going to be needed to supplement the professional. The episcopate, the priesthood, and the laity are not the only orders in the Church. One hesitates to breathe the words 'permanent diaconate,' for to arouse the inveterate antiquarianism of Anglicans is the surest way of bogging any practical proposal, and the very mention of a permanent diaconate is liable to result in a patristic field-day. Yet the name 'deacon' has certain advantages, of which the most obvious is that it is known and carries with it a measure of status in the minds of even the unecclesiastically-minded. And, if it be argued that a permanent diaconate would now have different functions from those of the primitive diaconate, the same criticism can be levelled against the present priesthood, which has by development become singularly unlike the primitive presbyterate. One prerogative of the deacons has already in certain conditions been allowed to lay-readers—the administering of the chalice. Circumstances drive us, whether we wish it or not, more and more to approximate the office of lay-reader to an order in the ministry.

It has seemed best not to bring the lay-reader on to the scene in this article till now, since the problem of a diminishing clergy has been apt to be seen too exclusively in terms of getting services taken. Yet it is a significant fact that already in many areas the services of the Church

only be carried on, and that in parish churches, because they are increasing frequency being taken by lay-readers and other laymen. h our flair for self-deceiving camouflage we hide this state of affairs der diocesan rules which seem to begrudge the lay-reader any rights ll. But here is a development in need of regulation before deteriora- sets in. Not that the services are being taken badly or sermons of unworthy quality being generally preached. Conscientious and ellent work is being done at the cost of sometimes considerable self- rifice. But the impression is gaining ground that it does not much tter who takes the service so long as it is taken, nor who says what ong as something is said. And, most of all, this is unfair on the ple who are doing this good work and deserve a better status than e the last resort of distracted churchwardens. It is not altogether prising that many from whom the greatest excellence might be ected demur at offering themselves for an office which the Church acknowledging so half-heartedly seems almost to despise.

We are, in fact, surrounding the services of the Church with an osphere of makeshift, and at the same time squandering one of the t of our resources. For were there no emergency, it would still be nstrously wasteful not fully to exploit the treasure-house of gifts to found among an admirable laity. But now this becomes a matter urgency. May it not be that in a depersonalizing age the mercy of d drives us to find our true riches in persons rather than in things— fellow-ministers rather than in their money? In fellow-ministers or it is an authentic ministry that is needed and one that will be cognized as such in the congregation. What better instrument could re be for such a purpose than a diaconate organized and trained by se who would then be archdeacons in practice as well as in name? e office of lay-reader should be abolished. The name carries with associations which militate against its dignity. Moreover it is un- sirable that the conducting of services and preaching should be regated from a measure of other work in the parish, such as their ular avocations might leave the members of a part-time ministry ne to fulfil. Doubtless most lay-readers do undertake other Church rk, but not specifically as lay-readers. The deacons should in their pacity of deacon be leaders of groups, in some cases visitors of the k and, resuming an original function of the diaconate, dispensers of or funds. Thus various streams of lay leadership and function that ve arisen or might arise in the Church would meet in a definite order. For the deacons would be deacons, not super-laymen.[1] They would ordained by the laying-on of hands; they would receive their rticular charisma; they would be entrusted with due measure of thority; they would be ministers of the word and, in the assistant pacity proper to them, of the sacraments. The orders would be ven; the trimmings could be optional. For we might hope to draw st-rate material from environments in which to have 'Rev.' attached one's name and a peculiar collar to one's neck would prove an

[1] Nothing is said in this article about deaconesses, since the question of their exact tus is liable to raise qualms and arguments such as might distract from the main ue.

impossible incubus. They would have one foot in the factory, the field, the counting-house, the other in the sanctuary. Here indeed is a more practicable and less artificial means of providing such a link than in pressing already hard-pressed priests to widen their experience at the conveyer-belt. But romantics who talk about a peasant ministry should be told that this is neither Italy nor Chaucer's England. For effectiveness in the hoped-for England of to-morrow a part-time ministry will need, not high-brow, but genuine academic standards and the discipline of serious study. And this is necessary to be said since there is a tendency to seize upon the idea of a part-time ministry as primarily a means of solving the problem of those whom selection boards regretfully refuse. Certainly a place might be found in it for many of them, and there would be room for all types. But chiefly we should wish to attract those whose various qualifications in other walks of life might render them especially apt for work of this particular kind.

One has heard it said that nobody is content to remain a deacon, but this is hardly surprising so long as to remain a deacon is altogether unusual. But when the diaconate ceased to be known as a mere passage-way to the priesthood and was accorded its own honourable functions, an entirely different attitude towards it might be expected to arise. On the other hand the fact that priests passed through a period as deacons would emphasize and advertise the point that permanent deacons had real part and lot in the clerical estate. The diaconate would become a widespread feature of the Church's polity, but first there is opportunity for limited experiment. Here and now there is nothing to prevent such experiment with a few selected individuals or, more usefully perhaps, in a few selected areas. Thus details could be worked out through experience, for there would be not a few details to be decided. Should there, for instance, be any payment other than of expenses, or should it all be on a voluntary basis? But discussion of intriguing details should not be allowed to distract from the urgency of the need.

Urgent it already is and it will become steadily more urgent. It demands to be taken beyond the stage of perennial debate in the Convocations. If we are to maintain a network of localized organization that can in any sense be called national, if we are not to become merely itinerant and congregational, an imaginative fact-facing adaptability will have to be forthcoming of which we show few signs at present. Certainly money will be needed, but on every showing there will be insufficient money to keep things going as they are—still less as they were. One could wish that there might be fewer grandiose and rather frantic financial appeals to all and sundry and more reliance placed on both the regular giving and the potential abilities of the faithful. For then the Church might become known to the public as something more dignified than a 'charity,' and time and energy be found to lay living foundations for a strange but not unhopeful future.

FRANK BENNETT.

The Christian Understanding of History[1]

God," says Victor Hugo, "makes visible to men His will in events, bscure text, written in a mysterious language." Christianity is an rical religion. It claims not only that it is founded upon concrete, rical events, but that in these particular events God Himself has d in this world of men. Hence history, for the Christian, is what bishop Söderblom has called "the workshop of revelation." rtheless it is, to revert to the former metaphor, "an obscure text, en in a mysterious language"; so much so that the secular historian fail to find in it any thread of meaning. This is admitted by the H. A. L. Fisher: "Men wiser and more learned than I," he rks, "have discovered in history a plot, a rhythm, a predetermined rn. These harmonies are concealed from me. I can see only one gency following upon another as wave follows wave. . . ."[2]

this age of disillusionment which has witnessed the collapse of the teenth-century dogma of progress, it is not easy to avoid Fisher's icism unless we bring to history a faith in the providence of God. Christian of necessity interprets historic events in terms of his experience of God. The principles which he applies are those h he has discerned as implicit in God's dealings with him as a n. These principles, as much as the events which he seeks to pret, are the data with which he begins. Hence, in one sense, udgment of the significance of history must remain a judgment of .; nevertheless his guiding principles themselves are ultimately ved from history, since his own experience from which they are ced is itself 'historic'—it is part of the time process.

The Nature of History. The saying that history repeats itself is rading and untrue. History consists of events, and events are acterized by their unique particularity. They are non-recurrent. different leaves on a tree, they are never exactly the same. It is uniqueness which is the hallmark of the historical and which les it sharply from the cyclic, recurrent element in nature. The ter is the presupposition of the historian just as the latter is of the ntist.

his is not to say, however, that history is a mere chronicle, a mere s of events threaded together like beads on a string. It is not a rd of every event, but the "record of things worthy to be remem- d." Hence the events of which it takes note are those which have aring upon the life of the group; those which are important, not only he individuals concerned, but also for the community as a whole. s a process of selection underlies the historical record. The rian must select, and in selecting he must evaluate. But his uation will be determined by his own viewpoint, by his own rpretation of events. History, then, is the record, not merely of ts, but—implicitly at least—of their meaning for those concerned. , to quote Tillich, "the totality of remembered events, which are

a paper read to the Sheffield Theological Circle (here considerably abridged).
History of Europe, preface, v.

determined by free human activity and are important for the life of human groups."[1]

But one proviso is required by Tillich's definition: history is not entirely "determined by free human activity"; it is rather the resultant of the interaction of man's free choices and the contingency of nature. "The character of the religious and historical process," says Berdyaev, "presupposes a profound clash and interaction between the Divinity and man, between Providence, divine fatality and necessity on the one hand, and the unfathomable mystery of human freedom on the other."[2] Instances of this clash leap to mind. Pharaoh thwarted at the Red Sea, Sennacherib's army decimated by plague, the destruction of the Spanish Armada, and, although to a lesser degree, the retreat of Napoleon from Moscow, all witness to necessity frustrating the free choice of man. Thus, as Bevan maintains, "history is made in part by the voluntary choices of men and in part by natural processes in which except in so far as they are interfered with by human volition, God's will must be perfectly carried out."[3]

ii. *The Hebrew Contribution.* Two diverse interpretations of history were current in the ancient world—the Greek and the Hebrew. The root of their differences is to be found in their respective conceptions of God and the value that each assigned to time.

For the Greeks God was the impersonal Absolute, τὸ ὄν, conceived of as a kind of fiery 'substance,' an all-pervading 'ether,' static and immanent. Platonism had attributed a cyclic nature to the time process, and this idea was developed in the Stoic philosophy. Time was thus deprived of any real significance and history reduced to an endless series of recurring cycles.

The Hebrews, on the other hand, regarded God as Righteous Will—personal, dynamic, and transcendent. He was removed from the world process, yet His power was operative within it. He dwelt in the high and lofty place, yet He came into contact with men. Where?—on the highway of history. God is known to the Hebrew "for what He is by what He does." Creation is the beginning of His work; His mighty acts in history attest His sovereignty in spite of all evil powers. He will eventually show Himself as supreme. C. H. Dodd summarizes the Hebrew interpretation thus: "The prophetic writers of the Old Testament, then, declare that a series of events in the history of their people exhibits 'the mighty works of the Lord'; the call of Abraham, the Exodus and the giving of the Law, the conquest of Canaan, the kingdom of David, the Captivity and the Return. Whatever human or natural factors may enter in, the ultimate ground of this series of events is the purpose of God, who freely chose Israel to be His people and who uses alien peoples to fulfil His designs. But it is to be observed that this purpose is never conceived to be *completely* revealed in the history of Israel: the complete revelation waits for the end of the historical process—an end which most of the prophets conceive to be close at hand."[4]

The prophets view these mighty acts of God in the light of a futur

[1] *The Kingdom of God and History*, 108.
[2] *The Kingdom of God and History*, 41.
[3] *The Meaning of History*, 36-7.
[4] *History and the Gospel*, 32-3.

ent, and their full significance will be seen only when the series is mplete. Hence another mighty act still in the future is proclaimed, e last act, the ἔσχατον, which alone can give meaning to the whole. is final event is the Day of the Lord. For the early prophetic writers is an event within history when Jehovah will vindicate His cause. sociated with it are the purifying and exaltation of Israel and the bjection of the heathen world. But for the later apocalyptists the nscendent element replaces the historical: the Day of the Lord eans a new heaven and a new earth; the dead are raised and the ing transformed. "The meaning of history, therefore," says Dodd, s determined by that which lies beyond history. . . . In reaching its nclusion, history passes beyond itself."[1]

It is to the Hebrews, then, that we must acknowledge the beginnings a philosophy of history. But furthermore, as we shall now see, it is to eir prophetic insight, born of direct communion with God, that we e the basis of that interpretation of events which is integral to the ristian faith. We may fittingly conclude this section with words of rdyaev which summarize succinctly all that has been said above: t was the Jews," he says, "who contributed the concept of 'historical' world history, thereby discharging, in my opinion, the essence of eir specific mission. They were the first to conceive the world as storical fulfilment in contradistinction to the cyclic process of the reeks. . . . For the Jews the idea of history turns upon the expecta-n of some future event which will bring with it a solution of story."[2]

iii. *Christ the Fulfilment of History.* A marked characteristic of early hristian preaching is its appeal to Old Testament prophecy. To the odern mind there is in many of these appeals a certain naïveté which akes them unconvincing. Nevertheless their main purpose is clear d valid. They testify to the Christian consciousness that in the fact Christ—His birth, His ministry of teaching and healing, His passion d death, His resurrection and exaltation at God's right hand—the ture event has happened, God's final mighty act has been accom-ished, the ἔσχατον has entered history. This, as far as we can gather om the New Testament records, was the starting-point of the first hristian preaching. The events comprising the life and death and surrection of Christ were regarded and proclaimed as eschatological ents. They were not merely important, or even the most important, ents, but happenings whose significance was decisive, crucial, final. the fact of Christ these first disciples were conscious of the breaking rough into history of something which was not in itself merely storical because it belonged to the eternal order.

It was in the light of the fact of Christ that the first Christians were le to read and make sense of the history of the past. This was the nal event which gave meaning to the whole series of God's mighty ts. The great historical happenings of the past were but a preparation r it. Israel had been chosen, called, and brought into a covenant lationship with God; His Law had been revealed to them; they had en delivered from their enemies and made to possess a good land;

[1] *Ibid.*, 20. [2] *Op. cit.*, 28.

the Messianic promise of a future intervention of God to establish in forgiveness a kingdom of righteousness and peace had been given through the prophets; for why?—that at the end of a long period of preparation this peculiar people might receive God's final Word in Christ. The fact that these preparatory events took place for the most part on a narrow strip of land on the eastern edge of the Mediterranean, and were concerned with a people whose political significance was nil, in no way invalidates their meaning or importance. As Dodd points out: "An historical religion attaches itself not to the whole temporal series indifferently, nor yet to any casual event, but to a particular series of events in which a unique intensity of significance resides. This selection of a particular series is not incongruous with the nature of history itself. The particular, even the unique, is a category entirely appropriate to the understanding of history; and since one particular event exceeds another in significance, there may well be an event which is uniquely significant, and this event may give a unique character to the whole series to which it belongs."[1]

But this final, decisive event was to be the ἔσχατον: this conclusive entrance of God into history was to be the end of history. Alongside of the prophetic expectation of it as an historic event, there was the apocalyptic emphasis upon its transcendent character by virtue of which history would be wound up. Moreover, Jesus Himself had spoken of this transcendent aspect of His work which would bring the present order to an end: "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven" (Mark xiv, 62). The New Testament relegates this function of Christ to a Second Advent, but it is clear that this is not at first regarded as a further event but as the consummation of that mighty act which had already taken place in the coming of Christ. The years passed, however, and the Lord did not appear. Hence the indivisible unity of the first and second advents became broken, and the latter tended more and more to take the form of a second crisis as yet future. God's mighty act in Christ, however, is continued in the life of the Church which is His Body, and thus the real unity of the Incarnation and the final consummation is maintained.

Nearly two thousand years have passed since this decisive act of God in Christ was made manifest in human history. What of the story of man's destiny during this period? Is it capable of interpretation, or is it merely "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing"? To this problem we now turn. We may not be able to elucidate it fully, but if what has been said above be true we shall find light upon the mystery and the clue to its solution by relating it to the fact of Christ. "This," says Berdyaev, "is the central event in world history, the event towards which history had been moving and from which it has since proceeded; the event which makes of the Jews, as it were, the axis of universal history."[2]

iv. *The Christian Interpretation.* Until recent years all our modern historical thinking has been dominated by the nineteenth-century idea of progress. We supposed that man was gradually getting better and

[1] *Op. cit.*, 29-30. [2] *Op. cit.*, 92.

ter; that one by one his evils would be eliminated; that he would ally throw off the sin which doth so easily beset him and build usalem in London and Moscow, New York and Berlin. In many arters this passed as a Christian doctrine; the leaven was already rking and would finally leaven the lump.

There are, however, two great objections to this dogma of progress. e first is that it deifies the future at the expense of both the present l the past. Past and present are made subservient to some dim and tant paradise. Every generation but the last is only a means to an l. Men must live and die merely that their carcasses may pave the for some 'nobler race' who shall one day inherit the earth.

The second objection is that this theory is denied by concrete, torical facts. We have, of course, progressed in certain limited eres—technical, cultural, and scientific; but to admit this provides ground for the assertion of a gradual and inevitable conquest of os by cosmos and evil by good. The unearthing of ancient Babylon, ose culture in many ways excelled our own, but which nevertheless ished and was for centuries unknown, is one of the rocks on which h an assertion must founder. The stark facts of the present-day world m another. "I sometimes picture the Victorian," says Lord lifax, "who had lived and died in the comfortable and comforting lief that we were marching in orderly fashion 'from precedent to cedent,' returning to life to-day. He would be astounded no doubt the material conveniences with which we had added to the ease of e, but he would be still more astounded by the moral *retrogression* of rope and this devastating perversion of youth in Germany."[1] If some ils have been eliminated, new and more terrible ones have taken their ace. In fact every advance in social life, in culture, in means of com- nication and scientific development brings with it new possibilities of sorder and confusion and sin. The aeroplane, which promises to unify e peoples of the world, at the same time threatens their destruction.

If, then, we can no longer accept the doctrine of progress as the ristian interpretation of history, what shall we put in its place? e have seen that the central event of history is the fact of Christ. ur very division of time into A.D. and B.C. is a recognition of this. e have seen too that the Hebrew people formed as it were the axis of e pre-Christian world. They were the vehicle of divine truth, the culiar people through whom God prepared the way for the coming o the world of His Son. But God's ancient people repudiated their heritance and killed the Prince of life, and the Christian Church ok its place as the New Israel of God. Now the Church is the Body Christ, and through it God's mighty act in Him is continued until is consummated by His return as Judge. Thus the Church is a pernatural society; it is composed of those who have "tasted the owers of the age to come" (Heb. vi, 5); it is the temporal manifestation the Kingdom of God in history. Hence the Church is to-day what e Hebrew nation was in the pre-Christian world—"the axis of uni- rsal history." The recognition of this fact is, I believe, the first step the construction of any Christian interpretation.

[1] Speech at Oxford University, February 27, 1940.

Further, we have seen that in the light of the fact of Christ the early Church was able to discern within pre-Christian history a process of preparation achieved in and through the Hebrew nation. Corresponding to this we may see in the twenty centuries A.D. a process of reception and judgment which is accomplished through the instrumentality of the Church. By the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments men and nations have been continually confronted with the fact of Christ, and so called to decision concerning Him. Those who respond are received into the Christian community, and those who reject the appeal declare themselves at enmity with God. In this way the Church is what Dodd has called "the instrument of a divine intervention in history."

The effect of this process of reception and judgment accomplished in history through the Christian Church is the division of men into two camps, and the gradual sharpening of the distinction between good and evil. "It is significant," says Reinhold Niebuhr, "that the New Testament invariably pictures human history as moving toward a climax in which evil becomes more naked and unashamed, pride more arrogant and conflict more overt." Speaking of New Testament apocalyptic visions, he goes on to say: "Taken seriously, though not literally, they obviously point to an interpretation of history in which there is no suggestion of a progressive triumph of good over evil, but rather a gradual sharpening of the distinction between good and evil. This is exactly what happens in human history. The corruption of a civilization represents a worse form of evil than the comparative anarchy of barbarism. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that history moves from the comparative chaos of primitive society to the order *and the anarchy* (*i.e.* the destruction of order) of civilized society. Each new elaboration of social cohesion makes a greater realm of order in human society possible, but also exposes that order to a greater degree of anarchy if any dislocation should take place."[1]

This view of history as manifesting a gradual sharpening of the antithesis between evil and good is represented pictorially in the parable of the tares and the wheat (Mat. xiii, 25 *f.*), where both grow together until the harvest. The latter represents the climax towards which history moves—the second coming of Christ as Judge. In order to comprehend the significance of the time process, it is necessary to postulate for it a beginning and an end. Without these the conception becomes meaningless. Hence the Bible encloses human history within a mythological framework which begins with Creation and the Fall and ends with the Last Judgment.

As we have already seen, the consummation of God's final act by the coming of Christ as Judge is integral to the New Testament Gospel. What does it mean? It means, first of all, that this world will not abide for ever; that "here have we no continuing city" (Heb. xiii, 14); that just as history has had a beginning, so it must have an end. This is a fact which science confirms. Our world began as a nebula of fiery gases which finally cooled and solidified; but, according to the second law of thermodynamics, it is like a clock which has been wound up

[1] *Europe's Catastrophe and the Christian Faith*, 35-6.

d is gradually running down. There will come a time when it will n down altogether, and life on this planet will cease.

But the doctrine of the Second Coming maintains that just as the orlds were framed by Christ the living Word of God, just as He was e divine Agent in Creation, so too through His agency will the nsummation, the final winding up of the whole process of human e on this globe, be achieved.

Furthermore, the Second Coming of Christ is associated with dgment. It is true to say that a principle of judgment is at work roughout all history. "There are many judgments in history," says iebuhr, "beside the final judgment. . . . Nations and civilizations e destroyed because they violate the law of God and are unable to tablish justice."[1] D. R. Davies develops this idea further when he ys: "The law of moral consequences, of cause and effect, is a judgment. evolutions are an expression of judgment. Was not the sack of Rome n 410 a judgment? Was not the Reformation a judgment of Renaisnce Catholicism? Was not the Cromwellian revolution a judgment n Feudalism? . . . History is always passing judgment in the sense at time at last reveals the full meaning of civilizations and institutions."[2]

But the Last Judgment which is associated with Christ's Second Coming is not to be confused with this process whereby history reveals he true nature of institutions and events. It is the Last Judgment—an vent which is as definite as it is absolute and final; a revelation of the eal significance and worth of all man's labours and achievements; a disclosure of the meaning of his many-sided civilization with all its iumphs and evils, its wonder and its barbarity. "The Last Judgment," says Davies, "will reveal the meaning of history in its totality."[3]

We have endeavoured to survey history in the large, and attempted o decipher its "obscure text" in the light of its central event. One inal question confronts us—What is the purpose of God in it all? Well, if Christ is the final, decisive event which gives meaning to istory as a whole, and the Cross is the focal point of His life, we need not hesitate to affirm with Tillich that "human history is ultimately to be interpreted in terms of salvation."[4]

R. Abba.

Mr Eliot's *The Family Reunion* in the Light of Martin Buber's *I and Thou*

In her essay *The Quest for Salvation in an Ancient and a Modern Play* (Oxford, 1943) Miss Maud Bodkin has discussed the relations and the differences between Mr T. S. Eliot's play *The Family Reunion* and the *Eumenides* of Æschylus. In brief her thesis is that, though in both plays the theme is salvation, the salvation of Orestes is set within the wider context of the community (the city-state of Athens) by the establishment of a new order of justice, while the salvation of Harry

[1] *Op. cit.*, 41. [2] *On to Orthodoxy*, 156-7. [3] *Ibid.*, 157. [4] *Op. cit.*, 119.

Lord Mountchesney in Mr Eliot's play is strictly limited to his personal destiny. Harry is saved *out of* the 'waste land,' the disintegrated and confused society of modern times, and the order of life into which he is destined to move is only vaguely described—and always in terms of his personal life, never in objective description of what kind of new world he is preparing to enter. It is

> Somewhere on the other side of despair.
> To the worship in the desert, the thirst and deprivation,
> A stony sanctuary and a primitive altar,
> The heat of the sun and the icy vigil,
> A care over lives of humble people,
> The lesson of ignorance, of incurable diseases.

Again,

> Harry has crossed the frontier
> Beyond which safety and danger have a different meaning . . .
> For him the death is now only on this side.

The assumption by the family that he intends to be a missionary Harry explicitly denies, but he is unable to tell them, in any way that they might understand, why he is going away, and where. The most that is vouchsafed is a hint here and there, and always in the personal context. Thus, in Harry's own words, now he is able "to live in public." Or, in the closing words of the play, the curse is ended

> By intercession
> By pilgrimage
> By those who depart
> In several directions
> For their own redemption
> And that of the departed—
> May they rest in peace.

In spite of this final reference to a greater company or community the interest remains fixed on the personal salvation of Harry; he goes out from the familiar world, goes against it, and as

> in a world of fugitives
> The person taking the opposite direction
> Will appear to run away,

so Harry enters in loneliness into the way of his destiny.

The interest of Miss Bodkin's analysis lies, first, in the fact that she refers the whole theme to the wider context of modern life. Of course, this is Mr Eliot's own achievement; but it is rare to find this appreciated. A modern poet is seldom taken so seriously; even if it is admitted that he takes himself seriously, the admission usually comes late enough to make it convenient to criticize him for his 'historical' significance, or his technical method, or his place within a tradition, or for some other impersonal, secondary achievement. Modern critics have largely lost the expectation of power, they have forgotten that the poet may be consumed with the desire to express living and significant experience, that the word may be 'a burning fire shut up in his bones' which he is bound to speak.

It would seem that Mr Eliot's work is of this kind, and any attempt

isolate him within his obscurity, though it may be justifiable with me of his poems, especially his earlier ones, is bound to fail here. r the story of Harry's salvation is a story of movement out of isolation o relation, of the passage from the obscurity of pursuing fate into nging and light': in the drama itself the disintegration and darkness d confusion of contemporary life are deeply shown, and a poet who s so clearly can be charged with solipsism only by those who have t yet realized the tragedy of unreal, and lost, personal relationships. hen Mr Eliot says, elsewhere, that "the poetry does not matter," rhaps he is aware of the common expectation that poetry should nd well, or by some other device entertain in an idle hour.

In fact, in *The Family Reunion* Mr Eliot presents such a passionate ncern for the predicament of modern men as is rarely found even ong writers more usually credited with an interest in such matters. ilosophers and theologians are supposed to be equipped for the derstanding and presentation of man's chief end. While this may true in the aftermath of a period of ferment, *within* such a period men who can speak to their age are those (whether philosophers theologians or poets—or a mixture of all three) whose emotional prehension forces on them the use of words, and who are able to e thought and passion into a single living whole. If it may not be d that Mr Eliot has perfected that fusion, at least the purpose is ere and clearly exhibited.

The second point of interest in Miss Bodkin's study is her elucidation the play's meaning in terms of what is coming to be described as e 'I-Thou' philosophy. Her explicit references are to Prof. John acmurray's writings, but the salient passages of the play are striking amatic renderings of, and parallels to, the work of the earlier writer the same field, Martin Buber.

I do not know if Mr Eliot has ever consulted Buber's work,[1] but that es not greatly matter. It is not really surprising when two original nds, at work on similar material, should present similar conclusions, d even have a common vision. Though Buber comes rather from the mp of the philosopher or the theologian or the mystic, and Mr Eliot m that of the poet, they speak the same authentic language of those o meet in the waste land of man's soul. Bound only by the compul- n of their insight, each ignores the traditional limits of philosophical d poetic activity—and attempts to answer anew the old question, *hat is Man?*

Buber distinguishes two fundamental attitudes in the world, that nstituted by the world or sphere of persons and that constituted the world or sphere of things. The first is the world of relation and meeting, the second that of experiencing and using. In the first we e able truly to be persons—that is, above all in relations with other rsons—and here real life is found; in the second are found the multi- rdinous affairs of experience, organization, accumulation of informa- n, and everything that is commonly regarded as the real world. To ber this is the world of *It*, into which the other world, the world of

[1] English translation, *I and Thou* (T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 3rd impression, 1944). other volume of Buber's writings, *Between Man and Man*, should appear this year.

Thou, is constantly passing, and must indeed pass. For we cannot live all the time in the moment of meeting, when we are able to 'dare to love *all men*.' 'Without *It* man cannot live. But he who lives with *It* alone is not a man.' By the aid of these two categories, and their by no means simple interactions, Buber proceeds to analyse the chief modern phenomena—religious egotism, sentimentalism, authoritarianism (in religion as well as the State), and so on.

This tiny summary of the main theme of *I and Thou* is not intended to do more than direct the reader to the work itself. But it should be clear that Buber is dealing with the crucial situation of our age, with the critical sickness of civilization. More and more desperate organization is offered as a substitute for real community; exaltation of rival 'causes,' with their confused and contradictory proposals, offers temporary and false stimulus to the growingly despairing peoples; and everywhere the world of *It* assumes greater and greater power. Man is less and less regarded as a possible *person*, and more and more as just an individual, an item, another *It* to be used for the profit of the 'cause' or the 'organization' or 'progress.' But those who use men in this way are involved in the common fate. They are pursued by fate, they cannot any more go out to meet destiny. The world of persons, which is both the purpose of human life and the fructifying power in the world of things, has in effect been abandoned by modern society.

Within the scope of dramatic presentation, in the life of Harry Lord Mountchesney, Mr Eliot deals with the same theme. The Eumenides' pursuit of Harry is, as Miss Bodkin points out, something far more searching than the whisperings of a stricken conscience, and more deep-seated in Harry's personal life than any theory of 'repetition-compulsion' can reach. Thus, Buber writes

> But how can the man in whose being lurks a ghost, the *I* emptied of reality, muster the strength to address the incubus by name? How can the ruined power in a being to enter into relation be raised again, when an active ghost tramples continually on the ruins? How does a being gather itself together, that is madly and unceasingly hunted in an empty circle by the separated *I*?

This might have been written as a description of Harry's condition on his first appearance, with the '*I* emptied of reality'—that is, of the power to enter into relation, and 'madly and unceasingly hunted.' . . . This is one with

> The sudden solitude in a crowded desert
> Thick with smoke,

with

> The cancer that eats away the self,

with Harry's words to the Eumenides themselves,

> When I knew her, I was not the same person,
> I was not any person,

and with

> that sense of separation
> Of isolation unredeemable, irrevocable . . .
> . . . I not a person, in a world not of persons
> But of contaminating presences.

Harry's quest is for being in place of non-being, for the world of *Thou* to inform the world of *It* with streaming life, for *himself* as a person in place of a meaningless fugitive from fate.

He attains this goal, and it is possible to understand the nature of his attainment more clearly by comparison with these thoughts of Buber's than by any other means. The customary categories of religion fail to give understanding. His family, spectators and chorus rather than actors (with the significant exception of Agatha[1]), watch without understanding. But this is not because Harry's salvation is an exclusive or private matter for himself; but rather because it is the reverse: truly personal, bringing about an integration of his whole being, unlimited in possibility. The common categories of religion, or more justly the common realization of these categories in the lives of those who profess such experience, are clearly limited. Salvation has there the significance of being saved as an individual out of the world, or of being given an assurance of eternal life, or of entering into a more vivid apprehension of the value of traditional forms of worship. Harry is saved out of the terror and confusion of ordinary living; but at the same time he has not left the ordinary world. The significance of the scene where Downing, the chauffeur, says that his master will not need him much more is surely not that Harry is about to leave this earth, but rather that now he is *whole*: he is *responsible*, for he has responded to the eternal *Thou*. He has faced fate, addressed it—that is, seen it for what it is, and thus attained true freedom. Thereafter he lives in the present, in the Presence, in the 'moment' of meeting with other persons. As Agatha says to him,

> There are hours when there seems to be no past or future,
> Only a present moment of pointed light
> When you want to burn. When you stretch out your hand
> To the flames.

Compare this with what Buber has to say about the 'moment,' in which the *Thou* appears—*e.g.* on page 30, "lived in a 'duration' whose purely extensive dimension is definable only in terms of itself."

Harry now knows such a burning present; he is solitary no more. He is 'bound up in relation,' ready for true fellowship. Now he is able to "live in public" because he can now distinguish truly between personal life and public life, and allow the latter to be clarified and vivified by the former.

Far, therefore, from entering on an exclusive way, and (as in the eyes of the family) setting himself apart, Harry is entering on the real possibility of human life. And if it be objected that when he says to the Eumenides

> Now I see at last that I am following you,
> And I know that there can be only one itinerary
> And one destination,

[1] Significant because with her Harry shares 'pursuit of a common liberation': she is for him the one who becomes a person, a *Thou*, thereby lifting the curse.

his transformation cannot be more than a merely private and personal matter, because lacking the precision of dogmatic formulation, we can only insist that this is no more concession to the possible audiences of the play, but seems to be of the very nature of Harry's attainment. To use the accepted terms for salvation, and to raise once again the clichés of traditional usages, would be to involve Harry once again in the world of things. His finding of himself, his becoming a person, is *absolute*. In a sense therefore he represents the hope of modern man, what modern man must be if he is to continue to live as man. "He who enters on the absolute relation is concerned with nothing isolated any more; but everything is gathered up in the relation. For to step into pure relation is not to disregard everything but to see everything in the *Thou*, not to renounce the world but to establish it on its true basis."[1]

In conclusion, then, Mr Eliot and Martin Buber share that loving insight into the predicament of modern men which enables each in his own way to express the imperative necessity of discerning the basic, life-giving world of the Spirit, of the eternal *Thou* addressing men, and making them persons. That the work of both writers is so generally regarded as obscure and 'precious' is another indication of the stifling dictatorship of the 'world of *It*,' forcing on us all a terrifying insensitivity to real life.

R. Gregor Smith.

Why You Should Read It—V.

PEARSON'S "EXPOSITION OF THE CREED"

We are come, as near as we possibly could, to the Church of the Apostles and of the old Catholic bishops and fathers; which Church we know hath hitherto been sound and perfite . . .; and have directed according to their customs and ordinances not only our Doctrine, but also the sacraments and the form of common prayer.

So wrote Bishop Jewel in 1564.[2] His words, which describe what was being attempted by the theologians of the Elizabethan settlement, have been at no time more loudly echoed than during the seventeenth century. The Caroline divines would not permit that private interpretation of Scripture *simpliciter*, upon which the other Protestant bodies of the period based novelties of order and doctrine. Nor would they allow the claim of Rome to infallible exposition. We find rather a constant interplay between appeal to the Bible and appeal to the early Church. The Scriptures have a unique authority to which the Church must submit; nevertheless orthodox patristic exposition of the Bible in support of the traditional creeds and ministry of the undivided Church carries greater weight than any other. And, indeed, it was the early Church which both produced the N.T. and gave the Bible as a whole that halo of authority which has so fascinated the Protestant mind. The Carolines therefore appealed to Scripture no less than their Puritan opponents, but with a reverent deference to traditional interpretation; for the Holy Ghost, however impeded, has exercised an

[1] *I and Thou*, pp. 78-9.

[2] *Apology*, p. 100 (Parker ed.).

pository function in the Church, and we ignore this at our peril. o quote Pearson's[1] words:

> Shun all attempts at novelty; enquire what was from the beginning; consult e sources; have recourse to antiquity; go back to the Fathers; look to the imitive church.

o-day we may see a curious parallel in a very different situation. he equivalent of private literal interpretation is revaluation of the ble after the purely historical and literary criteria of the Liberal itics. Our own generation of Anglicans is at last being forced to me more closely to grips with that Protean theological problem, the lfilment' of Scripture. Many, while not denying the importance and erest of the question "What is its historical or ethical value?", are htly insisting on asking also, "What has the Holy Ghost been saying, d has yet to say, by this to the Church?" Too few modern commenies on Scripture really concern themselves with the second question. nd in the present writer's opinion too few modern Anglican *compendia* doctrine really penetrate the theology of the Bible as a whole, in at deep unity of type, prophecy, and fulfilment which governed the rly Church's liturgical and dogmatic use of it. To acquaint ourselves th the relevant material in a concise form we cannot do better than sort to one of the Caroline expositions of the creeds. The three most seful and accessible are: (1) Thomas Jackson, *Commentary on the Ap. reed* (1613-38)[2]; (2) John Pearson, *Exposition of the Creed* (1659)[3]; 2) Isaac Barrow, *Sermons on the Creed* and *A Brief Exposition of the Creed, e Lord's Prayer and the Decalogue, to which is added the Doctrine of the acraments* (1669).[4] All three works contain weighty material on Faith nd on Theism in the opening sections, of great interest to the philoophical specialist. The reader less fortunate in time or capacity will e wise to limit his attention to the thoroughgoing Biblical exegesis of And in Jesus Christ" and the following articles. In this Jackson is ncomplete, and (even in the abridged edition) wanders a good deal. arrow is the most easy to read of the three, being more of a preacher han a theologian. Pearson, however, whose work is easier to come by, more profound in his thought and more ordered in his writing, espite his somewhat ponderous and rough-hewn style. To him we hall devote the rest of this article.

John Pearson was born in 1612 at Great Snoring in Norfolk, and ducated at Cambridge. In 1645 he became chaplain to the King's rces in the west. On their collapse he retired to London, where he ved quietly until the Restoration, helped privately by patrons. In 654 he accepted an invitation from the parishioners of St Clement's, astcheap, to deliver a weekly sermon in their church. These disourses, written up at their request, were published with a dedication o them, under the title of *An Exposition of the Creed*, in 1659. In 1661

[1] Preached before Cambridge soon after the Restoration. *Op. Min.*, ed. Churton, , 6.
[2] In *Works*, V, Oxford, 1844. Also published (abridged) by Whittaker, 1899.
[3] Various editions by Burton, Oxford, 1833-57.
[4] In *Works*, IV-V, Oxford, 1818.

Pearson took an active part in the Savoy Conference, and became Lady Margaret Professor at Cambridge. The following year he became Master of Trinity. He was consecrated Bishop of Chester in 1673, where he remained until his death in 1686. His younger contemporary, Bishop Burnet, wrote in that year:[1]

> He was in all respects the greatest divine of the age: a man of great learning, strong reason, and of a clear judgment. He was a judicious and grave preacher, more instructive than affective; and a man of a spotless life, and of an excellent temper. His book on the Creed is among the best that our Church has produced.

Pearson has been aptly described as "a schoolman with the scholarship of the Renaissance,"[2] and in his philosophical works openly avowed his admiration of Aquinas.[3] This has left its mark, not merely in his treatment of the first section of the creed, but also in the extraordinary clarity and order of the whole work. There is a standard treatment of each clause: first, a synopsis of the subdivisions to be followed (they are often very elaborate); then the exposition itself; then a homiletic section called "the necessity of belief"; and lastly a summary. Full quotations from the Scriptures are woven into the text; references to the Fathers and other sources are relegated to notes, lest "he who is not acquainted with any learned language might be disturbed in his reading" (Intr.). For an example let us summarize Pearson's exposition of "He suffered."[4]

(1) WHO? In *office*, Jesus suffered as Messiah: (*a*) the Messiah must suffer (Is. 53, etc.); (*b*) Jesus did suffer; and (*c*) fulfilled the types of the Passover-lamb, the Uplifted Serpent, and the Sin-offering. In *person*, he who suffered was the Son of God made flesh.

(2) HOW? He suffered in his human nature only (*communicatio idiomatum* expounded).

(3) WHAT? (*a*) True pain of body; (*b*) true anguish of sin-bearing in the soul.

Necessity of our belief: (1) that we may be assured that he took our nature upon him; (2) that we may know satisfaction to have been made thereby for our sins; (3) that we may share his joy and glory in his sufferings; (4) that we may be assured of his compassion towards our own sufferings; (5) that we may learn ourselves how to suffer.

Summary.

Particular mention must be made of the notes. It is becoming a commonplace that "the patristic scholarship of the Carolines was as a rule more extensive than deep."[5] Their erudition is amazing, but their use of it very disappointing to the modern theologian. There are three reasons for this. The age was dominated by controversy, and in most of the dogmatic treatises quotations from the Fathers were

---

[1] *History of His Own Time* (pubd. 1724), orig. ed., vol. I, p. 694.
[2] Cheetham, *Masters in English Theology* (1877), p. 226.
[3] See the opening remarks of his *Lectures on God and His Attributes*, *Op. Min.*, vol. I.
[4] Pp. 315-37. (Refs. here and below to vol. I of the 1833 ed.; the second vol. contains the notes.)
[5] Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, p. 129, a good example.

apt to be used not unlike hand-grenades. Secondly, the age of Bentley[1] and Porson had not yet dawned, and the approach to the patristic texts was often as uncritical as the approach to the text of the Bible. Thirdly, the Carolines were inevitably influenced by unconscious medieval presuppositions. In the first two respects Pearson is a remarkable exception. The *Exposition* is non-controversial. The author's *Vindiciæ Epistolarum S. Ignatii*,[2] which anticipated Lightfoot's critical work, reveals a scholar of really outstanding excellence. In consequence those who have Latin and Greek will find the patristic quotations sufficiently aptly chosen (to illustrate both scriptural exegesis and the formulas of orthodoxy) as to be well worth study to-day.

Those who have learned from writers like Quick[3] and Dix to appreciate the contrast in theological *ethos* between the primitive and the medieval Western Church cannot fail to note a certain medieval flavour in the *Exposition*, a work professedly scriptural and patristic. It is not true to say that the apostolic perspective of cosmic redemption and realized eschatology is absent. Pearson is full of references to the Church as the Mystical Body, scandalously visible and containing within itself both good and bad, yet risen with Christ. "While we look upon him at the right hand of God, we see ourselves in heaven."[4] Nevertheless the Atonement theology scattered over the whole book is most clearly Anselm's ("a reconciliation of an offended God and a satisfaction unto a just God"[5]), though Anselm's writings on it are nowhere quoted in the notes. And the 'frame' within which the Gospel is set is the inexorable vindication of the supreme law of *justice*. Pearson can assume it to be self-evident that "every sin doth cause a guilt . . . a debt or obligation to suffer a punishment proportionable . . . though the sin itself doth pass away."[6] He rejects the patristic tradition of Christ's triumphant harrowing of hell on the significant grounds that a deliverance of souls from hell would upset the careful justice of God.[7] "This power of Satan still is left as subservient to the demonstration of the Divine justice. . . . To the reprobate and damned persons death is not destroyed but improved."[8] While the question is too big to be discussed here, it is good to be shocked, by an Anglican theologian of Pearson's excellence, into realizing how far our everyday theological thinking shirks the tension between the Law and the Gospel, Justice and Love. A reading of Pearson suggests the fruitful reflection that the breakdown in Western civilization of the old strong sense of an unshakable moral law, the descent into an "age without standards," has been closely paralleled by a disastrous theological loss of the medieval insight into the *objective* gravity and guilt of sin. We cannot afford to lose that insight when we reject as pernicious much of the theology in which it was embedded.

[1] Bentley himself, who became Master of Trinity in 1700, referred to Pearson's scholarship in (for him) most glowing terms (*Diss. on Phal.* (2nd ed.), pp. 424-5).

[2] Abp Ussher (1581-1656), for whom Pearson had great admiration, vindicated the genuine text of the Ignatian Epistles in a book published in 1644. Pearson's *Vindiciæ* (1672) was a defence and development of Ussher's work against the attacks of the French scholar Daillé.

[3] See *Gospel of the New World*, ch. V. [4] P. 478. [5] See esp. pp. 255, 368, 612-6.
[6] P. 608 (art. X). [7] Pp. 405-17 (art. V). [8] Pp. 475-6 (art. VI).

In conclusion we commend Pearson's judicious and restrained use of typology. Examples are: Joshua (pp. 133-6); Joseph (p. 422, 461); the Throne of David (pp. 469-70); Mary and Miriam (p. 299). At a time when the whole question of 'fulfilment' is being re-examined, these passages are of especial interest.

BASIL S. MOSS.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Dr Robinson is assistant curate of St Matthew's Church, Moorfields, Bristol.

The Rev. Frank Bennett is Rector of Wigan.

The Rev. R. Abba is Minister of Cemetery Road Congregational Church, Sheffield, and Lecturer in Divinity at Sheffield City Training College and in the Extra-mural Department of the University of Sheffield.

The Rev. R. Gregor Smith is the translator of Martin Buber's *I and Thou*.

The Rev. B. S. Moss is Sub-Warden of the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln.

CORRESPONDENCE

METHODS IN THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Cox's article in the December number needs to be supplemented with the following information about the Church of Ireland. In 1945 further legislation was passed on the mode of electing Bishops, which might be thus summarized:

On the occurrence of a vacancy in any see the Standing Committee of the General Synod selects a list of not more than three persons and communicates them to the Diocesan Synod. These three names are added to the Diocesan Synod's select list for voting, which latter consists of three names put forward by the clerical members and three by the lay members of the Diocesan Synod. On these nine names, the Diocesan Synod votes, each member voting for one person only. The requisite majority is two-thirds of the members of each order, present and voting.

If no decision is reached, the appointment of a bishop shall pass to the House of Bishops.

On the occurrence of a vacancy in the see of Armagh the House of Bishops shall meet and shall by a majority of the votes of those present and voting elect one of their number to the Archbishopric of Armagh and Primacy of All Ireland.

Yours, etc.,
GEORGE SIMMS.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
DUBLIN.
December 13, 1946.

BOOK REVIEWS

'Essor de la Littérature Latine au XIIe Siècle. By J. de Ghellinck, S.J. 2 vols. L'Edition Universelle, 53 Rue Royale, Brussels. 325 fr.

It has become customary of recent years to speak of the 'twelfth-ntury Renaissance,' mainly because modern research has revealed the stonishing range and variety of the scientific and humanist movement that time, as well as its achievements in the fine arts and in historical riting.

But we are beginning to realize that such conceptions are of only mited value and may indeed be a hindrance to historical under-anding. The so-called Renaissance which used to be regarded as e prelude to the modern world is now seen as the true child of the iddle Ages, and even the scientific movement of the seventeenth ntury had its roots there. The lesson of continuity cannot be too ongly emphasized. The humanism of the twelfth century as well as s scientific leanings go back to the eleventh century, and the eleventh ntury built upon the achievements of its predecessors.

But the twelfth century is marked by outstanding characteristics. olitically, it is conspicuous for the growing power of centralized ates in England, France, and Sicily. In Germany there was a great xpansion eastwards, and in Italy a growth of intense corporate life the towns. The Papacy was almost at the height of its power. The athedral schools, the households of bishops and even the courts of rinces were centres of study, of philosophical and theological specula-on as well as of civilized intercourse. If the monasteries had begun to se the leadership of learning in an age which went after the new hilosophers, like Roscelin, Gilbert de la Porrée, and Abélard, they ere still places where the classical authors and the Fathers were read, nd they were, very largely, the homes of the new religious poetry, rst represented by the sequences of Adam of St Victor and his school.

It was a century in which great men and lesser men impressed their ndividuality upon their writings, because their minds were richly ored from leisurely reading, and they had not yet abandoned the uthors' for the sole pursuit of that dialectic which was already ecoming, in Dr R. L. Poole's words, "the ruling passion of the me."

It is only necessary to mention names like Anselm, who died at the ginning of the century; John of Salisbury, the great humanist and bserver of men; Hugh and Richard of St Victor, steeped in Augustine nd Platonism; lively writers and wits like Geoffrey of Monmouth, raldus Cambrensis, and Walter Map; and epigrammatists and irists like Godfrey of Winchester and Nigel Wireker. Apart from all ese, there was Bernard of Clairvaux, a master of sacred eloquence, nd, as Donne puts it, of "mellifluous language," who spoke to the art and used the Latin tongue as an instrument obedient to his uch. William of St Thierry, Ailred of Rievaulx, and Guiges II of the rande Chartreuse are other great names.

It was an age of able historians, such as John of Salisbury, who is

now known to be the author of the *Historia Pontificalis*, Robert of Torigny, Ordericus Vitalis, Otto of Freising, and William of Tyre.

The insatiable intellectual curiosity of the time is reflected in the unremitting attempts made to obtain translations of Arabic, Greek, and Hebrew works. Philosophers, theologians, mathematicians, natural scientists, and physicians saw clearly enough that their first business was to master the existing body of experience and knowledge. There were men who were ready to face any difficulty or hardship in the fulfilment of this quest. The names of Adelard of Bath, Robert of Chester (translator of the Koran), Alfred of Sareshel, Michael Scot, come to mind among many others. Pope Alexander III stirred up the Latin archbishop of Antioch to be a little more active about procuring for him a Greek text of Chrysostom. The Norman kings of Sicily had a school of translators. Byzantium was the source of patristic texts; at Toledo, it was Aristotle, translated from the Arabic, and Arab and Jewish works of philosophy, science, medicine, and astronomy.

These are a few, and only a few, of the aspects of twelfth-century Latin literature. I have said nothing of sermons, of the large and varied literature of hagiography, and of political and religious controversy, of the art of letter-writing, of grammatical treatises. I have not mentioned Peter Lombard, Gratian, or Peter Comestor—or a dozen others of almost equal importance, some of whom stand on the margin of what can be described as literature. The point I wish to make is that all these aspects are ably and sufficiently set out in the two volumes of Fr de Ghellinck's admirable work, which is the first real attempt at a literary history of the twelfth century. It will prove an invaluable handbook to the student; it is sound in judgment and, in spite of the difficulties created by the war and the hardships of foreign invasion, it is very much up to date in its use of recent research. Scholars have owed a great deal to Fr de Ghellinck since his important book on the theological movement of the twelfth century, which appeared in 1914. It is to be hoped that he will soon provide us with a literary history of the thirteenth century.

A few corrections would seem to be called for in a second edition. Writers on medieval literature (I have sinned with them) have been slow to cease to separate Philip the Chancellor from Philip de Grève, in spite of hints to the contrary, followed by positive proof. Fr Callus now (*Mediæval and Renaissance Studies*, i, 1941) tells us quite clearly that we must assign to Philip the Chancellor the body of poems and prose works which used to be placed under the name of Philip de Grève. Nothing is known of any works of the latter.

It is also somewhat disconcerting to find, on page 96 of vol. i, a reference to Walafrid Strabo as the original author of the *Glossa Ordinaria*, an attribution which, as Miss Smalley says in *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*, p. 40, has long been discredited. There is a misprint on page 64 of the same volume, which assigns Brunetto Latini to the fifteenth instead of to the thirteenth century; and on page 70, the late Sir J. E. Sandys, of St John's College, Cambridge, is described as of Harvard University.

F. J. E. Raby.

Harpenden.

E Parish Chest. A Study of the Records of Parochial Administration in England. By W. E. Tate. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

At a time when the History Schools are being led to consider afresh right relation of research training to general historical reading, re has come from a village school house a book which would pear to represent, wholly in intention and hardly less in attainment, proportion the universities are looking for. For research into ochial records is manifestly Mr Tate's life interest: his unveiled husiasm for his subject and, if a reviewer may say so, his humility ore it, place him in the front rank of those zealots for antiquarian rsuit by whom so much local history has been written and parochial hives have been explored. But it is his wider knowledge of social l administrative history which enables him to interpret the local terial, and which in fact makes his book the useful work it is. For uments do not explain themselves; their meaning has to be wrested m them, and this in the light of their origin and the intention they ve. The miscellany of briefs and terriers, certificates and indentures, ords and returns, which any parson might find in his parish chest, ld only baffle him unless he had some guide to the central legisla-n, ecclesiastical and civil, in obedience to which these documents re produced. Mr Tate set out to provide this guide, and he has ceeded.

He describes in turn "records mainly ecclesiastical"—registers, urchwardens' accounts, charity, glebe, and tithe returns—and cords mainly civil"—those of the civil parish and its officers, poor administration, highway maintenance and agricultural economy. illustrates each type from a wide variety of sources, chiefly those nted in the volumes of local record and historical societies. He tches enough of the social background, and cites enough of the mon or statute law, to explain what each document is for and why comes to lie in the parish chest. He provides competent documenta-n in the notes, a glossary of technical terms, generally accurate, ugh in instances loose, an appendix of statutes cited and another of ord societies arranged by counties. He has an elementary biblio-phy for the wider study of parochial affairs. The reference section es not supersede such indices as those of A. M. Burke and J. C. Cox d the Institutes for historical and genealogical research; it is intended y as a guide to them. There are abundant quotations from paro-ial documents of every sort from the time of the Reformation and er, few before. They are always interesting, often amusing; too en in their witness to misery and vice they utter judgment, not so ich upon bad men, as upon bad laws and simply stupid administra-n. There are fifteen photographic plates. There are hard words, irely just, for those, clergymen and lawyers, who in their custody records disastrously combine negligence with the motto of the vy League.

On his subject Mr Tate writes with authority, and especially on closures and the administration of the poor law. His book merits re than praise: it is too good to escape with an uncritical review. s translation of *yconomi* as *business men* (p. 83) is unusual; his

distinction between *canons* and *constitutions* is untenable as he makes it (p. 304). Another, alleged between *christened* and *baptised* (*ibid.*), is left obscure; can these distinctions in fact be drawn? He ought not to expect to find visitation records normally in the parish chest (p. 149); they were compiled as *memoranda* for the visitor, not for the parish visited, and were commonly taken home with him. Over-compression sometimes leads Mr Tate into inaccuracy of statement. One may not allege that "in the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the amount of travelling seems to have diminished" (p. 240) without some qualification; three centuries is a long period, and within it there were as many factors making for the increase of travel *in some areas* as Mr Tate cites in general for its decline. More serious is the allusion to St Neot's, in Cornwall, on page 101; by noticing in succession the buying of ten gallons of sack there for the Easter communion in 1664, a distinctly worldly agreement for the disposal of "spare wine at the Sacrament," made in Shropshire in 1808, and the sixth rubric after the communion service in the Book of Common Prayer, he leads us to believe that the curate of St Neot's in 1664 was a gluttonous man and a winebibber. But on reference to the page in Cox (*Church-Wardens' Accounts*, p. 95) from which the incident is drawn, we find it is used there in an imputation of dishonesty to the churchwardens. It matters little now which was the guilty party—there may even have been collusion between them—but it matters to the historian how he presents his facts. Lastly, the description of the statute 4 Hen. IV, c. 12, as "a statute annulling all impropriations of vicarages" (p. 135), were it not inaccurate, would reflect seriously on the effectiveness of parliamentary legislation, for it is obvious that no such annulment was ever intended or made. The story behind the statute, as it may be pieced together from Episcopal and Papal Registers and the Rolls of Parliament, was roughly this: the prior and canons of Launceston were trying, with an outlay of gold and silver as extravagant as their professions of poverty and need, to persuade the Pope to dissolve three Cornish vicarages and to let them appropriate the revenues and serve the cures by their own canons or other stipendiary priests—this in defiance of canon and statute law. They were opposed at Rome by an emissary of the Canterbury Convocation, and between the two parties the contest swayed. The poor parishioners, anticipating a victory for the prior and convent, petitioned the King in Parliament. The reply was that "The King has ordained in this Parliament sufficient remedy for the case"—namely, this statute, 4 Hen. IV, c. 12. After confirming the provision for the vicar and the poor secured in statute 15 Ric. II, c. 6, it declared void all appropriations of vicarages made *since the first year of the said King Richard* (with one exception specified) and forbade any religious to be made vicar in any church so appropried or to be appropried in time to come. Mr Tate has unfortunately obscured the purpose of the statute, its scope and its effectiveness—for the churches kept their vicars. We may cordially endorse his hope for another edition in which these slips may be corrected.

G. R. Dunstan.

Hawarden.

HE STATE AS THE SERVANT OF GOD. By Phillip S. Watson. S.P.C.K. 4s.

This book is a useful contribution to the urgent reconsideration of ristian politics. Those students who must read political philosophy a history degree would find Mr Watson's opening chapters—"The enace of State Sovereignty" (the concession to the Curtis fallacy is ghter than the title suggests), "The Necessity of the State," "The thority of the State"—an excellent introduction to the great curring themes of Christian thought upon the temporal power. oreover, Mr Watson tells us, "the chapters are the result of a pro- ged debate in the writer's own mind, which has led him by degrees m the position of a Christian pacifist to that of a non-pacifist Christ- n"—and, though the particular setting of that problem (in the dealism of Peace" in which most of us fumbled 1929-39) has passed, ere is much weighty argument which still needs debate and discus- n, and may prevent the superficial idealism of the pre-war years m rearing its ugly head in the atomic age.

There is a third merit of the book. Luther keeps breaking in. A ng series of footnotes provides a catena of Luther upon the subject "Weltliche Obrigkeit" sufficient to demolish a few common fallacies out his teaching. And Mr Watson proves, I think, that much of hat Luther said upon his own problems can illuminate and deepen ir own very different setting. Mr Watson would be very happy if commended the book for these footnotes, but indeed his book has her merits. I am not quite sure how far the categories of this dis- ssion are adequate to the really modern setting—especially of the odern revolutionary dynamism which no doctrine of sovereignty or *lebensraum* can explain. It is interesting to turn from Mr Watson's eatment to the lecture on Romans xiii which Karl Barth gave in e grim context of Germany this summer, to observe how K. L. hmidt's reference of *exousia* to the angelic powers does leave room just such discussion of revolutionary dynamism. But there is in rth's lecture a stress on the lordship of Christ which exactly chimes th Mr Watson's fine closing chapter on "The Sovereignty of Christ," d, if Barth is less certain of Luther's correctness than Mr Watson, th are concerned to tell us that Luther is not to be blamed for a od deal of later Lutheranism. And if, with Mr Watson, we think uther erred in not allowing a right of rebellion, we do well to remem- r that Luther had not to meet the problem in its cruelly sharpened te-sixteenth-century form, while we can glimpse what the problem Christian participation in resistance means only when we think of etrich Bonnhoeffer's wrestling torment with the problem of participa- n in the bloody overthrow of the Nazi régime. " 'I believe one ly Christian Church' is as much an article of faith as the rest of the reed. Reason cannot perceive it, even if it puts on its spectacles." uther expresses here a doctrine of the Church which has to be held gether with his doctrine of the 'visible church,' and perhaps we ght to turn from a reconsidered doctrine of the State to a new ctrine of the Church, and one which will do more justice to the mbiguity of the Church than Mr Watson, in the space he has, is

able to do. I fear some readers may give too hasty assent to all the truths he expresses about the Church not brooking interference, and rebuking the State when necessary, without remembering that an unrepentant church in our time cannot upbraid the government—say for "political mishandling" in Germany—or protest against military interference with Church courts, when the Church itself has neglected to set its own house in order. Forget that, and we shall get an anti-clerical but not a penitent State; if the State is, as Mr Watson finely portrays its offices, the Servant of God, the Church must remember its own lowly calling as Servus Servorum Dei.

GORDON RUPP.

WESLEY HOUSE,
CAMBRIDGE.

EXPLICATION DE LA DIVINE LITURGIE, par Nicolas Cabasilas. Introduction et traduction de S. Salaville, A.A., in *Sources Chrétiennes*, collection dirigée par H. de Lubac, S.J., et J. Danielou, S.J., editions du cerf, 29 Bd de la Tour Maubourg, Paris; editions de l'abeille, 9 Rue Mulet, Lyon, 1943. Prix: 70 fr.

This is a new French translation of a commentary on the divine liturgy by the greatest theologian of the Byzantine Middle Ages. The introduction serves to show that Cabasilas was never Metropolitan of Salonica, as the earlier editions suppose. He lived and died a layman, writing for educated laymen in a church that expected all to take an active part in liturgical worship. His *Life in Christ*, summarized here, is an edifying illustration of the piety of the Byzantine laity in the middle of the fourteenth century. We need an English translation of both books, the *Vita in Christo* and the *Explicatio*, not only for historical but for practical purposes.

Such a translation should take account of Fr Salaville's notes on the passages where Cabasilas defends the Byzantine liturgy against the criticisms of "certain Latins," and argues that until relatively recent times East and West had agreed in their theories of consecration, for Latin writers allowed that the consecration of the eucharistic elements was completed by the prayer "supplices te rogamus," which Cabasilas regards as a sufficient, though somewhat obscure, epiclesis. The theory that the words of institution complete the consecration is a new invention. Fr Salaville is at pains to point out that Cabasilas goes to the other extreme, and against his own tradition, when he insists that these words are spoken "in a narrative manner"; yet he produces support in unexpected quarters for his author's view of the development of Latin theology. I have not been able to check all his references, but the passages quoted from Paschasius Radbertus,[1] Peter Lombard,[2] and John Teutonicus, a commentator on the canon law about 1215,[3] seem to me very important. Moreover, some such theory is necessary to explain the silence of Greek and Latin controversialists on the form of consecration, while they argued with such violent heat upon the matter of the sacrament, extremists on the Greek

[1] P.L. 120, *c.* 1311-12; *cf.* also *c.* 1279, 1286, 1287, 1290. [2] P.L. 192, *c.* 868.
[3] Vermeersch-Creusen, *Epitome Juris canonici*, 3rd ed., Malines-Rome, 1927, t. I, No. 45, p. 34. I have not verified this reference (*Explication*, p. 175).

e denying that the eucharist could be consecrated in unleavened ead.

his idea that the *supplices te rogamus* is an epiclesis, recognized as h by Byzantine theology, and at one time intended to complete the secration of the elements, has been discussed and rejected by many rgical experts, who rely on earlier evidence. Discussion of the shape he liturgy will continue for a long time yet. The points raised by basilas are of wider interest in that they relate to the validity of logies between the eucharist and the other sacraments, all, he in- s, consecrated by prayer, and to the date of the development, in zantine as well as in Western Christendom, of any precise theory as "moment of consecration." It seems to me that while Cabasilas inizes," as he must do for the purpose of a controversy with the ins, his sacramental doctrine is set in a tradition that recognizes no ntial difference between the eucharist and chrism. Both are full the grace of the Holy Ghost.

GEORGE EVERY, S.S.M.

ELHAM.

SHORTER NOTICES

mons and Hymns. By Timothy Rees. Mowbray. 5s. 6d.

vent to Easter. By Sir Percy Maryon-Wilson. Christ Church Book Case, St Leonards-on-Sea. 4s.

mons for Evensong. By J. H. Ward. Mowbray. 6s.

The late Bishop of Llandaff's book consists of a collection of sermons, articles from *C.R.*, and of hymns. All too few of each, one feels. Those us who heard the Bishop preach will be able to recapture something the warmth of his prophetic fire. "He did not come to preach gospel; He came in order that there might be a gospel to preach." he greatest cleavage that divides the Christian world to-day is t the cleavage between High Church and Low Church, between tholic and Protestant, or between Churchmen and Nonconformists, t the real cleavage is between those who believe in the victory of rist and those who do not; in other words, between those who lieve in redemption and those who do not." This last comes from sermon preached at the Church Congress at Bournemouth—was it the twenties? It has taken most of us another twenty years to reach e same conclusion, and some of us are not there yet. After the fire e still small voice—the tender, supernatural, common sense of ome stray thoughts on Vocation." The tone of tenderness sounds ain in the Lullaby for the Infant Jesus and the fire glows in the very xt hymn, familiar to many as 688 A. & M.

Sir Percy Maryon-Wilson's sermons belong to the *genre* of which the e Prebendary Mackay was the master and are not unworthy of that aster. This is the book to give to a friend—alas, that such people are wer and older than they used to be—who knows how to read devo- nally. They read well and, what is more important, carry over into ne's meditations.

Mr Ward's book is a present for a busy clergyman. It consists of

carefully prepared outlines for sermons on the second lesson at Evensong throughout the year. Not every preacher will find that he can use them, but those who do cannot fail to inspire their congregations with some of the shining personal devotion to our Lord which is their ever-recurrent theme. There are weaknesses, some slight and easily avoided. One need not speak of living 'overcomingly' or of the 'motif' of the C minor Symphony of Beethoven. More serious is a failure to understand the supernatural nature—NOT the supernatural mission—of the Church. He can write of the heavenly city in the last chapters of the Revelation: ". . . there is a 'city' beyond the dreams of the Church and it is the Church's business to create it. This means the city's increase and her decrease—her eventual obliteration. . . ." This failure to grasp the unity of the Church and the Heavenly City impairs the message that Mr Ward has to deliver. We know what he would have his congregation do, but what does he want them to be? One turns back to the Bishop: "It may not be amiss at this point to remind ourselves that our Lord is not the founder of a religion called Christianity: He is the founder of a society called the Church."

GERALD FITZGERALD.

PAIGNTON.

The Priest's Companion. Knott and Son. 10s. 6d.

This is a new edition of a book which has been in use for some time amongst Anglo-Catholic clergy. Apart from the fact that its compiler evidently cannot assume in those who use it familiarity with the Latin tongue (for much that is in Latin even in the latest edition of the *Priest's Book of Private Devotion* is here done into the usual English of 'advanced' books), its *ethos* is Roman, though the compiler prefers the word "Western." This *ethos* is not altered by the inclusion of a number of prayers from Eastern saints and liturgies, and loyal Anglicans will not be any the more ready to accept erroneous and strange doctrine because it is found in Eastern as well as in Western teaching. We do not understand how Anglican clergy are able to reconcile prayers that attribute our bliss hereafter to the mediation of the Blessed Virgin; or to address such a prayer to "The Saint of the Day" as may be found on page 162; or to use such mariolatrous language as may be seen in "A Prayer to Our Lady," from a Byzantine office of thanksgiving on page 199, and in a similar prayer on page 182. In a book of over 400 pages there is much that is useful and some things that are beautiful, and in the introductory pages profitable remarks are made about such subjects as meditation. But they are marred by the perversely ingenious arguments and shifts necessary if one is to impose upon Anglicism the whole Roman theory and practice of the priesthood. One remarkable example of such perversity must suffice. On page 33 it is said to be "a grave violation of the form of the Office involving mortal sin . . . to follow a rite not one's own"; yet a few pages later it is concluded that the offices of the Breviary may and indeed should be substituted by Anglican clergy for Morning and Evening Prayer provided that "on Sundays and major feasts he says, or causes to be said, the Prayer Book offices in church." Two more

tations must suffice to indicate the gulf which separates those who . themselves able to use this book and the Church of their ordina- : page 73, in connexion with advice on a Rule of Life, "in the late rnoon or early evening the priest will also say his Rosary," and, on e 75, "it is a pious practice each month to select by lot one of the ts whose feast occurs during it as a patron for the month." "Lex ndi lex credendi"; no one doubts the sincerity and piety of the com- rs and users of such books as this, but the faith which inspires them ot that of the Church of England, and it is difficult to understand they remain in her Communion.

GLYN SIMON.

ANDAFF.

---

tan Architecture and its Future. By Martin S. Briggs, F.R.I.B.A. Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d.

This book is well written and well illustrated. It is a pleasure to and to handle. We are grateful to Mr Briggs for writing it. The tographs and sketches of xviith- and xviiith-century Noncon- nist places of worship will be appreciated by many, especially the rming sketches of the chapel at Horningsham, Wiltshire, and the pel at Bramhope, Yorkshire, the former dating 1566 and the latter 9. There is some very good detail in many buildings of this type period; the plan, too, of some of them is attractive. Mr Briggs is ious that a Nonconformist place of worship should be as unlike Anglican Church as possible, and no doubt he is quite right. It is, ever, doubtful whether he will succeed in impressing his views on his fellow Free Churchmen. Several of the illustrations give the ression that the wish in some quarters is to make the building as h like an Anglican church as possible, though this is not of course general tendency.

Our author is anxious to distinguish sharply between "altar" and ly table." This distinction does not obtain, however, in the Church ngland. It is true that the term altar is not found in the Book of mmon Prayer, but it is used in the Canons of 1640 and in the various onation services. It is also used frequently by early Anglican ters. It should also be noted that the word *mensa* was used to ribe the altar in pre-Reformation service books. The term ddes board" is of common occurrence in writings of the Middle s. Mr Briggs is definitely convinced that the whole outlook of the ority of Nonconformists is completely different from that of the urch of England. If this is so it is well that it should be clearly under- d before we commit ourselves to any scheme of reunion.

The book, which is of great interest to Anglicans, is quite invaluable anyone concerned in building Nonconformist places of worship.

XFORD.

R. D. MIDDLETON.

Old Testament Interpretation of History. By Christopher R. North. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Two sterling virtues distinguish Prof. North's book. First, he gives struggling students of the Old Testament a useful conspectus of conclusions and speculations upon it of recent scholarship. But

this is no mere textbook; the author's presentation of his subject is always stimulating and often convincing, particularly when he deals with the interrelation of history and interpretation of history; it is pleasant to find full justice done to such neglected books as Judges and Deuteronomy. His second virtue appears in Chapter VIII, where he makes a determined effort to face the question of the relevance of the Old Testament to-day and our modern misconceptions about it: "We unconsciously tend to think of the divine purpose as educative rather than redemptive" (p. 154).

That this attempt is not entirely successful is perhaps due to his belief that the only proof of the inspiration of the Old Testament is its intrinsic power of conviction (pp. 25, 158, 172). One consequence of this is that he is very lukewarm in his appreciation of apocalyptic. Hebert's *Throne of David* he dismisses in one line (p. 149). He can apparently see no genuine *witness* to the New Testament in the Old, only a certain measure of preparation. He makes the quite inaccurate statement that "Until very near the close of the eighteenth century no Christian had any doubts about the historical accuracy, or indeed the verbal inspiration, of the Bible" (pp. 156-7). We are left wondering whether what he most lacks is not a *liturgical* understanding of the Bible.

Prof. North's English constantly provoked this reviewer to pained protest. We can just endure the use of " prior to " instead of the old-fashioned (and no doubt more cumbrous) "before," which is apparently endemic in his style. But when he tells us on page 102 "That Ahab was peeved is no doubt true," he must be reminded that the style of a schoolboy's essay does not adorn a book upon *The Old Testament Interpretation of History*.

RICHARD HANSON.

THE QUEEN'S COLLEGE,
BIRMINGHAM.

Pauline Predestination. By Francis Davidson. Tyndale Press. 2s. 6d.

Words Worth Weighing in the Greek New Testament. By E. K. Simpson. Tyndale Press. 2s. 6d.

God's Word and Man's Response. By Daniel Lamont. Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 6d.

In the Tyndale Lecture for 1945 Principal Davidson gives us a useful re-handling of the doctrine of Predestination from a modern Calvinistic standpoint. He surveys the Pauline words, and certain of the *loci*, which illustrate St Paul's doctrine. Then he discusses the Pauline Doctrine more systematically, recognizing, however, that the Epistles are not formal treatises. He concludes with some notes upon later interpretations of the doctrine. Most attention is given to the passage in Romans ix-xi, with reference to the more recent English commentaries (Dodd and Kirk). His conclusion is that God does predestine individuals to glory with "infallible safeguards through life"; that this is not at all incompatible with individual responsibility (cp. Phil. ii, 12, 13; 2 Cor. vi, 1; 1 Cor. ix, 27); that predestination in

case of the wicked includes reprobation, though this is to be inguished from a decree of damnation (Calvin's extreme view not followed by Calvinists).

gainst the modern view, that St Paul's doctrine of Election is election to salvation, but only to service, he argues (pp. 20 *ff.*) former is necessary to explain the apostolic joy in the divine ction. This deserves consideration as exegesis; does it involve the clusion, which many Christians find repugnant, that God in fact ses over anyone by granting *sufficient*, but withholding *efficacious*, ce? One wishes that more had been said on the teaching of the ts Confession (p. 33) that predestination should be interpreted ough Christology.

n saying that he finds Mr Simpson's contribution to the Tyndale es of less value than Dr Davidson's, the reviewer hopes he is not luly swayed by his personal reaction to the author's style, which t him to his English dictionary, looking up obscure synonyms, more n than to his Greek. But it is difficult to see what exactly his ure was driving at. Was it to show that the papyri only take us a ited way in exegesis? to illustrate the help still to be gained from ssical authors? to protest against cases of misinterpretation due to ological prejudices? or to show how much the study of N.T. guage has to contribute to theology? His selection of words varies m important theological ones (Sect. I) to others of very minor interest t. VI). I find little help in the treatment of ἀπολύτρωσις or τήριον; on ἀπέχει in Mark xiv, 41, he is fanciful; but on p. 22 is an resting suggestion that the implied contrast to our Lord in Phil. ii, 6 ot only Adam, but also Lucifer (Isaiah xiv, 14).

Dr Lamont's sermon, published by the I-V.F., is a straightforward osition of the Gospel as God's Word to us in the Cross of Christ. attributes the ineffectiveness of much modern preaching to its curing of this Word; yet he admits that it can only come home to who is burdened with a sense of his sin. In answer to the evangel- perennial problem, he says that only confrontation with the Cross, meaning revealed by the Holy Spirit, can produce this sense of sin.

J. D. M. Stuart.

EBLE College,
Oxford.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

CKFRIARS: Ferdinand Valentine, O.P., *Whatsoever He Shall Say* (5s.).
KWELL: R. O. P. Taylor, *The Groundwork of the Gospels* (7s. 6d.).
NS Oates and Washbourne: Edmund F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *The Old Testament and the Future Life* (16s.).
BRIDGE University Press: C. H. Dodd, *The Bible To-day* (7s. 6d.); J. H. Hutton, *Caste in India* (18s.).
TERBURY Press: Charles Williams, *Flecker of Dean Close* (6s.).
RE Press: F. Biggart, C.R., *And then the Judgement;* R. Smith, C.R., *Pagans—Black and White* (4s. each).
SON: Various authors, *Democracy: Should It Survive?* (7s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Warner Allen, *The Timeless Moment* (10s. 6d.).
FAITH PRESS: George Branson, *The Church of England: its Way, Truth and Life* (9s.)
FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION: Kenneth Boulding, *There is a Spirit: the Nayler Sonnets* (2s.).
FRIENDSHIP PRESS (N.Y.): J. Davis, T. M. Campbell and M. Wrong, *Africa Advancing* (n.p.).
HODDER AND STOUGHTON: K. E. Kirk (Ed.), *The Apostolic Ministry* (£2 2s.); F. E. Christmas, *The Heavenly Child* (3s. 6d.).
HOLLIS AND CARTER: Robert Sencourt, *The Consecration of Genius* (21s.).
HOS JACOB DYBWAD (Oslo): Nils Messel, *Ezechielfragen* (Kr. 13.00).
I.V.F.: Rowland Hogben, *In Training* (5s.).
KING'S CROWN PRESS (N.Y.): Sydney A. Temple, Jr., *The Common Sense Theology of Bishop White* (n.p.).
LONGMANS: James Brodrick, S.J., *The Progress of the Jesuits* (16s.); G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester, *The Church and Humanity, 1939-46* (8s. 6d.).
LUTTERWORTH PRESS: H. G. G. Herklots, *The Epistle of St Paul to the Philippians* (5s.); C. J. Barker, *The Way of Life* (21s.); C. W. Ranson, *The Christian Minister in India* (8s. 6d.).
MACMILLAN: L. H. Marshall, *The Challenge of N.T. Ethics* (15s.).
MOREHOUSE-GORHAM: *The Story of Jesus* (20 cents); W. Norman Pittenger, *What does the Episcopal Church stand for?* (15 c.).
NISBET: Ernest R. Payne, *Henry Wheeler Robinson* (12s. 6d.).
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: K. E. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford, *Church Dedications in the Diocese of Oxford* (5s.); Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (15s.); Ralph E. C. Houghton, *Introductions to the Amended Lectionary, Table B* (2s. 6d.); G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew* (12s. 6d.).
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS: T. G. Dunning, *The Altar of Youth* (3s. 6d.).
S.C.M. PRESS: *God's Will for Church and Nation* (7s. 6d.); Gladys Keable, *Towns of Tomorrow* (2s. 6d.); Dom Bernard Clements, *Christ and Everyman* (4s. 6d.); A. M. Pullen, *Despite the Colour Bar* (4s. 6d.); E. Allison Peers, *Fool of Love* (6s.); Hope Costley-White and Joan Harwood, *Jesus the Child* (1s.); Stewart Herman, *The Rebirth of the German Church* (10s. 6d.); Eric Brewin and Reginald Johnson, *The Renewal of Democracy* (3s. 6d.); Geoffrey Hoyland, *The Man Who Made a School* (4s. 6d.); G. Ernest Wright, *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (6s.).
SHEED AND WARD: Henri Ghéon, *The Secret of St Martin* (7s. 6d.); Ronald Knox *A Retreat for Priests* (10s. 6d.); Gerald Vann, O.P., *His Will is Our Peace* (3s.).
SHRINE SHOP, WALSINGHAM: Enid Chadwick, *Mary Full of Grace* (3s.).
S.P.C.K.: *A Hundred Years of Blessing* (10s. 6d.); E. Allison Peers, *The Book of the Lover and the Beloved* (5s.); John R. H. Moorman, *A New Fioretti* (3s. 6d.); F. C. N. Hicks, *The Fulness of Sacrifice* (Third Edition) (15s.); E. W. Williamson, Bishop of Swansea and Brecon, *An Anatomy of Christian Joy* (1s.); F. W. Baggallay, *A Letter to those who, having been divorced, cannot be married in Church* (4d.); John C. F. Hood, *Icelandic Church Saga* (16s.).
S.P.C.K. AND NATIONAL SOCIETY: A. E. Simpson, *Christian Foundations* (2s.); J. R. Lumb, *The Teaching Parson and His People* (Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged), (6s.); S. C. Carpenter, *A Paraphrase of St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (1s.); E. R. Wickham, *Unto a Full Grown Man: Vol. VI, The Word of God* (3s.); Brenda Russell, *Leading the Children* (3s.); M. McIntosh, *The Way of the King* (1s.); J. A. Appleton, *The Lightbearers (Growing up in the Church, No. 9)* (6d.); Eleanor Martin, *Prayer and Praise in the Sunday Kindergarten* (1s. 6d.); *The Good Shepherd and His Flock: Course III — The Atonement* (1s.); *Handbook to the Scheme of Training for Church Children* (2s. 6d.).
STAPLES PRESS: Rosemary Hart, *Noah and His Ark*; *His Wonderful Works* (Illustrated by Alexander Morrison) (2s. 6d. each).
ZWINGLI-VERLAG, ZURICH: R. Liechtenhan, *Die urchristliche Mission* (S. fr. 7.80); E. Schweizer, *Das Leben das Herrn in der Gemeinde und ihren Diensten* (S. fr. 8.50); J. Hering, *Die biblischen Grundlagen des christlichen Humanismus* (S. fr. 3.20); Oskar Farner, *Huldrych Zwingli* (fr. 14.00).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher